DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 224 RC 006 499

AUTHOR	Haltom, John F.; Singleton, James F.
TITLE	From Indian Village to Chicano Suburb: Problems of Identity and Suburbanization.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Acculturation; Community; History; Land Settlement; *Mexican Americans; *Nonreservation American Indians; *Social Change; *Suburbs
IDENTIFIERS	New Mexico; *Tortugas

ABSTRACT

A case study of social change, this paper describes the community of Tortugas, an American Indian-Mexican village at the southern edge of Las Cruces, New Mexico. The Indian inhabitants of the community have been assimilated into the rural Mexican American subculture, which has become increasingly suburban through a process little explored in the literature on suburbanization. The study attempts to document the suburbanization of one community, to describe the problems suburbanization created, and, hopefully, to contribute toward the development of an adequate typology of suburbanization. Data is based on a combination of historical sources and 2 surveys: in the April 1972 survey, 145 interviews were completed; the second survey, completed in October 1972, was composed of 21 interviews with elected officials and influentials of Las Cruces and officers of a unique corporation--Los Indigenes. The conclusion indicates that the Tortugas community and other communities facing absorption into an urban complex do not wish to relinquish either their governmental autonomy or their life style. However, Tortugas appears to be drawn into the Las Cruces urban area by forces that appear irreversible. The people of Tortugas appear powerless to resist whatever fate leaders of the adjacent city may plan for them, be it annexation or re-creation of an Indian pueblo that never existed. (FF)

ED 068224

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FROM INDIAN VILLAGE TO CHICANO SUBURB: PROBLEMS OF IDENTITY AND SUBURBANIZATION

by

John F. Haltom
Professor of Government
New Mexico State University

and

James F. Singleton
Assistant Professor of Sociology
New Mexico State University

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RC006499

FROM INDIAN VILLAGE TO CHICANO SUBURB: PROBLEMS OF IDENTITY AND SUBURBANIZATION[1]

This paper is a case study of social change in the community of Tortugas, an Indian-Mexican village at the southern edge of Las Cruces, New Mexico. The Indian inhabitants of the community were assimilated into the rural Mexican-American subculture, which has, in turn, become increasingly suburban through a process little explored in the literature on suburbanization. In this instance a city grew out to a rural village, and in the process the village became an ethnic working-class suburb. This kind of suburbanization creates difficult problems for communities which have no governmental status, no effective community organizations, few economic resources and ill-prepared leadership but whose residents have developed expectations and attitudes that are largely suburban. The problems are compounded when the community wishes to retain both its ethnicity and its autonomy. This study will attempt to document the suburbanization of one community, describe the problems suburbanization created and, hopefully, contribute toward the development of an adequate typology of suburbanization.

The data on which this paper is based are a combination of historical sources and two surveys. In the first survey the investigators attempted to complete an interview with one adult member of each occupied dwelling unit in Tortugas with three call-backs if the respondent was not at home or was otherwise

unavailable at the time of initial contact. When the survey was finished in April, 1972, investigators had 145 completed interviews and seven refusals, for a refusal rate of 4.6%. The low refusal rate was in large part due to the fact that leaders of the community informed residents that a survey was forthcoming and encouraged cooperation. The residents, who are somewhat suspicious of outsiders, were very receptive to the interviewers, all of whom were Chicanos. The second survey, completed in mid-October 1972, was composed of interviews with elected officials and influentials of Las Cruces and officers of a unique corporation. The total number of persons contacted in the latter survey was 21 with no refusals, but two of the respondents were reluctant participants.

Changing Identity: Assimilation of the Indians

The precise origins of the first residents of Tortugas are clouded by myth and incomplete history. The City of Las Cruces was founded on the Rio Grande in 1849, presumably for the protection and convenience of the farmers cultivating nearby farms.[2] In 1852 the community now known as Tortugas was settled on the mesa a few miles south of Las Cruces. The most likely explanation of the establishment of a separate village so close to Las Cruces is that the settlement was to be composed entirely of Mexican and American Indians from the El Paso vicinity who would work on adjacent

farms and in the mines and forests of the nearby Organ mountains. By 1854 approximately 100 persons lived in the village.[3]

Little is known of the village during the remainder of the 19th century. Apparently, Piro, Manso and Tiwa Indians from Socorro (Texas), Senecu (Chihuahua) and Isleta del Sur (Texas) moved to Tortugas in the latter 19th and early 20th centuries.[4] The Mexican Indians settled in a section of Tortugas which they called San Juan, while other residents, who had come to call themselves Tiwa Indians, lived in a section of the community which they called Guadalupe. All inhabitants referred to the community as San Juan de Guadalupe rather than Tortugas. The residents of the area originally had no legal title to the land, and the question of ownership has been a recurring problem for more than eighty years.

Title to the land was acquired by a circuitous process. In 1907 the U.S. Government authorized the Dona Ana Bend Colony Grant Corporation to settle title claims to lands in the area in which Tortugas is located.[5] In 1908 the Dona Ana Bend Colony Grant trustees deeded title to the land in Tortugas to Eugene Van Patten, Francisca Abalos de Roybal (widow of Felipe Roybal, cacique of the Tiwas in Tortugas), Victoriano Abalos, and Bidal Minjares, as commissioners of the Town of Guadalupe.[6] Van Patten was a prominent Las Cruces resident who assisted the Tortugas residents in their successful efforts to acquire title to the lands.

Under the leadership of Van Patten, 36 "members of the Pueblo of Guadalupe" formed a corporation which they named Los Indigenes de Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe (the INHABITANTS of Our Lady of Guadalupe) in April, 1914. At that time, 54 persons were listed as members of the "pueblo" and association. The members then elected Van Patten president for life, Francisca Avalos, Regenta Caciqua and Treasurer, and chose a secretary, five capitans and a commissioner of buildings and work.[7]

According to its Articles of Incorporation, Los Indigenes was organized for the purpose of securing the moral, physical and intellectual development of the members of the "Pueblo of Guadalupe" and their families, to improve homes, lots, buildings, streets and plazas in the community, to own, maintain, and support a suitable Roman Catholic Church in the community and to provide for a cemetery. In addition, the corporation was authorized to acquire, hold and dispose of property, and "to donate and convey to members and their families any real or personal property belonging or that may hereafter belong, to this Association, to its members or their families when desired to assist them in securing a home, and improving a home".[8]

To the corporation thus formed, the Commissioners of the Town of Guadalupe on September 14, 1914, deeded all land that had been granted to the "Town of Guadalupe".[9] Thus by 1914 the "Indians of the Pueblo of Guadalupe" had received title to their lands in the name of a corporation whose lifetime president was a white man, Eugene Van Patten. When he resigned the presidency in 1925, Van Patten designated Victor Roybal,

son of the original cacique of the Tiwas of Tortugas, as his successor. Victor's brother, Vincente Roybal, succeeded his mother (Francisa) as cacique of the group calling themselves Tiwa Indians.[10] In the years following establishment of the corporation secular affairs of the community were handled by the president and officers of the corporation while religious matters (principally those associated with the three-day Feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe) were handled by the cacique. Over the years the number of Mexican Indians in the village increased. By the late 1930's a pioneer study of Tortugas reported that the village had become predominantly Mexican,[11] and commented upon its similarity to other rural Mexican villages. Increasing numbers of Mexican Indians were brought into the corporation through a process of two-thirds vote of the members and the blessings of the caciqua or cacique.

By the late 1940's persons of Mexican ancestry were able to take control of Los Indigenes. They elected Miguel Fierro president of the corporation in 1946, and a two-year squabble with the Roybals over rights to corporation papers and symbols followed.[12] In April, 1948, a state district court resolved the legal argument by awarding Fierro the corporation files, record books and seal.[13]

Control by the Mexican-American associates of the Fierro family was solidified through the re-incorporation of Los Indigenes in August, 1963. The stated purpose of the new corporation is the promotion of the religious, social and general welfare of the "Pueblo of Guadalupe". The corporation retains complete

control of the remaining common property, which has been reduced to some 20 acres of land largely through the deeding of lots to inhabitants. On this land are three buildings, namely the Casa del Pueblo, the modern version of a pueblo clan house, the Casa de Comida (for feasts) and a small oratorio, where a picture of the Virgin of Guadalupe is kept. The 30 members of the corporation concern themselves principally with the planning and direction of the annual three-day Feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe.[14]

In recent years followers of Vincente Roybal have made a concerted effort to gain recognition of Tortugas as an Indian village and to regain control of the lands possessed by the corporation. A letter in 1969 from the cacique to the Bureau of Indian Affairs produced no results.[15] Then on January 1, 1971, eighteen of the supporters of Vincente Roybal met in his home and drew up a constitution for the "Tewa Indian Tribe, San Juan de Guadalupe Pueblo, New Mexico". They named a "tribal governing body" consisting of the cacique (Vincente Roybal) and a group of elected officers, including a President, a Vice President, a Secretary, a Treasurer and Cacique Treasurer, a Capitan de Guerra, and four additional capitans. The constitution and tribal list were signed by 100 persons,[16] none of whom lived in Tortugas.

In the following months, Victor E. Roybal, Jr., acting as secretary of the "Tewa Indian Tribe"[17] waged an intensive campaign to have the "tribe" recognized and to gain control of its "ancestral lands", namely the tract of land now called Tortugas.

Letters and copies of the tribal constitution were sent to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Louis Bruce, presidential assistant John Ehrlichman, Senators Montoya and Anderson and Representative Lujan with proposals that the tribe be recognized by the United States and that the approximately 100 acres in Tortugas be established as a reservation.

The efforts of the Roybal group to gain BIA recognition of tribal status and rights to ancestral lands were unsuccessful. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs took the position that those alleging to be Tiwa Indians have never been recognized by the United States as Indians but had always been regarded as being "predominately, if not entirely, of Mexican blood." Commissioner Bruce opposed recognition of their Constitution by the Secretary of the Interior and expressed the opinion that any claim against the U.S. for land in New Mexico was barred by act of Congress. He had no objection to limited recognition in order that the New Mexico Tiwas might qualify for assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act. Such legislation had been enacted for the Tiwas of Isleta del Sur (near El Paso).[18]

When officers of Los Indigenes of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe learned of the efforts of the Roybal group to gain recognition as a governing entity and to present a claim against the U.S., they objected. They contended that Vincente Roybal and a group of his relatives and friends were acting against the wishes of the rightful officers of the corporation. They further contended that, aside from the cacique, the persons sponsoring the proposals were not, nor had they ever been,

members of the corporation, nor had they participated in the rituals of the 3-day feast.[19] Apparently no bill was introduced, and no lawsuit has been filed.

The contest for control of Los Indigenes and title to Tortugan land has been fought largely by persons not now residing in the community. Neither Vincente Roybal, the cacique, nor Margarito Fierro, the president of the corporation, resides in Tortugas. The quarter-century competition for control of the corporation lands and rituals reached nadir in 1971, when there were two sets of officers, both of whom had been sworn in by the cacique, Vincente Roybal. Of more signigicance is the fact that over the years the corporation has become little more than custodian of ceremonial properties and of the rituals of the three-day Feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe. Those persons claiming to be Indians no longer live in the community and the few remaining "Indian" activities are controlled by a corporation most of whose officers are Mexican-American and reside (with one exception) outside Tortugas.

If Gordon's stages of assimilation[20] are used as a basis for analysis of the history of the Indians of Tortugas, the completeness of their assimilation into the "host society", i.e., the Mexican sub-culture, is revealed.

(Table I about here)

The assumption of assimilation must, however, yield to a caution. The possibility of displacement of the pueblo Indians is suggested by the fact that the tribal list of Tiwa Indians prepared in 1971 contained the name of no current resident of Tortugas. In fact, the militant leader of the Tiwa faction contends that the land in Tortugas has been stolen from the pueblo Indians. Although New Mexico courts have rejected the claims of the Roybals, their claims can in reality be neither proved nor disproved.[21]

What can be said with certainty is that the present residents of Tortugas, whatever their origins, do not regard themselves as being of Indian ancestry. When they were asked to identify themselves culturally, 90.3% of the respondents in the survey of Tortugas households gave some species of the generic term Spanish-surname. The terms Spanish-American (26.2%), Mexican (21.4%) and Mexican-American (21.4%) were used most frequently, the terms Spanish and Chicano less frequently. Less than 5% of the respondents claimed cultural identity as Indians, and none used the term Native-American. Yet 9.0% claim 50% or more Indian ancestry, and 23% claim some amount of Indian ancestry less than 50%. If average-sized families are to be assumed, about 200 people in Tortugas have some Indian ancestry. However, it should be noted that the term "Indian" does not distinguish between Native-Americans and Mexican-Indians.

Suburbanization of Tortugas

Urbanists have refined the classification of suburbs according to function;[22] they have commented ad nauseum (and sometimes inaccurately) on the quality of suburban life;[23] and they have reported on the relationship between types of suburbs and policy expectations.[24] It has been noted that suburbs are no longer strictly white-collar middle class, if they ever were,[25] that they are not "lily-white",[26] and that they are not always affluent.[27] But an adequate typology of suburban development appears not to have been developed.

In his discussion of suburbanization[28] Clark describes both packaged residential developments (totally planned suburbs) and suburbs created by the sprawl of new housing on the outskirts of the city (unplanned with poorly defined or undefined boundries). He also mentions the "growth of the rural village into a community urban in character /as/ another example".[29] His main thrust is that there are many types of suburbs and that they come about through different processes.

Tortugas is obviously not a packaged residential development. While the community has grown from 90 families in 1938 to 151 families in 1972, that growth alone has not been sufficient to transform it into a suburb. Tortugas represents yet another model of suburban development based upon two factors: (1) the geographical expansion of a city to the borders of a small community, and (2) the development of suburban attitudes and expectations by the residents.

To the casual observer Tortugas appears to be anything but suburban. Half the streets are unpaved, there are no street signs or house numbers, an occasional outhouse assaults the esthetic senses, and many houses are of unplastered adobe, a condition which gives them a run-down appearance. But the city of Las Cruces has grown to and around Tortugas and thereby ended the community's geographical isolation

A more important measure of suburbanization than geography are the attitudes and expectations of the residents of a community. The survey revealed suburban attitudes and expectations are predominant among Tortugans. One indicator is the number and type of problems mentioned by the residents. Table II summarizes the types of problems perceived by Tortugans:

(Table II about here)

Overwhelming concern was expressed over the lack of services usually found in a city. Problems in this category comprise 83.1% of all problems mentioned. Concern about the physical condition of the community school was also relatively high on the list of problems. While 12.8% may appear to be a small percentage of concerned persons, the statistic assumes more significance when it is considered with the knowledge that children in Tortugas attend the community school for only their first two years. They are then transported outside to the Las Cruces schools.

Another attitude indicator is the rank order of importance of news events to the respondents. If the respondents are

truly villagers rather than suburbanites, one would expect them to be more concerned with local news than with events further afield. Table III shows the rank order of news events.

(Table III about here)

The response rate to this question was not overwhelming, only about one third of the respondents giving usable answers. The respondents not giving usable data fell into two main categories: those who said that all news was the same to them and those who said they were not interested in any news. The latter group tended to be the older respondents. Some respondents rank-ordered only two or three of the five possible types of events and did not respond on the other locations, hence the "no response" column, and the unequal N's reported at the bottom of the table. Despite these irregularities, the table clearly demonstrates preference for outside news.

A third indicator of suburban attitudes is acceptance or rejection of annexation to the adjoining city. Most of the perceived problems mentioned above could ultimately be solved by annexation, yet only 22.8% of the respondents gave positive responses to the idea of annexation. While 15.2% responded ambiguously, fully 60% responded negatively to this notion as a solution to their problems. Furthermore, 77.9% of the respondents gave no specific positive response (advantage), while 44.1% gave no specific negative response (disadvantage). The most frequently mentioned benefit of annexation was that it would bring in public services The only other benefit

mentioned was in the form of a general statement that community betterment would result. The most frequently mentioned disadvantage was that annexation would bring an increase in taxes. Other disadvantages included no benefits, preference for living outside the city and a feeling of being imposed upon ("leave us alone"). Second to taxes in frequency of mention were combinations of other disadvantages stated above. An obvious conclusion is that the residents reject annexation as a means of solving their problems because they want autonomy and do not want city taxes, clearly a suburban attitude.

The attitudes of Tortugas toward annexation differ from those of Las Cruces city leaders and the officers of the corporation Los Indigenes, both of whom have views on cultural identity and community problems that are congruent with those of the residents of Tortugas. Both city leaders and corporation officers tended to suggest some combination of federal, state and county assistance as a solution of Tortugas community problems. However, when specifically asked how they view annexation, 80% of the city commissioners and 60% of the other influentials favored annexation as a solution to the problem of providing city services. Eighty percent of the corporation officers were either opposed to annexation or gave ambiguous answers.[30]

Sufficient evidence has been submitted to establish the suburban nature of Tortugas and Tortugans. It is an ethnically homogenous working class suburb in which there is also some poverty (17.9% of the household have no household member employed).

According to categories established by the Bureau of the Census, 22.7% of the employed residents of Tortugas have sales and clerical jobs, 21.6% are service or domestic workers, 21% are operatives and 16.4% are laborers. In this respect the community is unlike Crestwood Heights[31] (an upper middle class suburb) and much like Ardmore or Penllyn,[32] black working class suburbs.

The uniqueness of the suburb that was formerly an independent village is demonstrated by a strong sense of community as evidenced by informal social participation. Unlike Berger's working class suburbanites, whom he characterized as non-mobile and complacent (the dream is fulfilled),[33] Tortugans, though also non-mobile, are not complacent about conditions in their community. Neither could Tortugas be characterized as a community of "limited liability,"[34] for the life of Tortugans is firmly rooted in the community. In contrast, responses by Tortugas residents to questions probing social participation indicate that the community is a close-knit one. Respondents reported that 81.4% of them have relatives in the village, and of these 78.7% visit their relatives at least weekly. Most of this visiting with relatives is on a daily basis. Two-thirds of the respondents visit with friends in their homes at least weekly, and half of the respondents go to friends' homes to visit at least weekly.

The only significant organizational participation of Tortugas is in church or church-related organizations. Sixty percent of the respondents reported belonging to such organizations,

and only two of these 88 memberships are outside the community of Tortugas. The strength of Tortugans' sense of community appears to provide an important force for retention of Mexican-American ethnicity as well as for retention of their governmental autonomy.

One predictable effect of the type of suburbanization depicted in this study is that it is likely to find leaders ill-prepared to cope with resultant problems and residents unaccustomed and unwilling to recognize the need for effective leadership. Data regarding leaders in Tortugas ("people who can get things done") are not encouraging to those who favor effective community action. A total of 51% of the respondents did not nominate any leaders; 17.9% indicated that there are no leaders in Tortugas, and another 33.1% said they did not know who the leaders are. Only one leader was nominated by 13.8%. There was a total of 151 nominations by 71 nominators, an average of 2.13 nominations per nominator. A total of 49 people were nominated, of which 30 reside inside and 19 outside the village. The leaders, number of nominations and percent of nominators and nominations are presented in Table IV below.

(Table IV about here)

As can be seen in the above table, five of the inside leaders were nominated as often as the president of the corporation, but only one leader (Gonzales) received more than 20% of all nominations (or was nominated by more than 20% of the nominators). Of the other leaders only Pablo Fierro, who

is presently an officer of, and has held every other office in, the corporation, is really a representative of the people of Tortugas. The list of outside leaders is included because the first four listed are officers of the corporation, the fifth listed is the cacique of the Tiwas and the last listed had the second highest number of nominations among outside leaders. Gonzales appears to be the only widely recognized leader in Tortugas.

Prospects for Improvement

The choices available to the people of Tortugas are not promising. First, they may choose to continue as they are, without services, as the City of Las Cruces grows around them. They may thus retain their autonomy at the expense of unhealthful conditions. Second, they may seek basic services from Las Cruces. Robert Gonzales led such an effort in 1969. Seventy-two Tortugas residents petitioned the City of Las Cruces for water and sewer service without success. Extension of services outside city limits is possible under New Mexico law only if the residents of the outside community pay for extension of water and sewer lines. Per family costs for expansions into Tortugas were estimated in 1969 to be $887.50 for water and $1336.11 for sewer service, costs which residents simply could not pay. The Las Cruces Director of Utilities estimates that costs would be 20% higher today than in 1969.[35] This choice does not appear to be a feasible one.

Separate incorporation is barred by a New Mexico law which prohibits the creation of municipal corporations within five miles of an existing city the size of Las Cruces.[36] Yet, continuation of the present unincorporated status will cause some difficulties. Most federal programs for assistance in providing water and sewer systems authorize grants to municipal corporations. Some grants can be made to nonprofit corporations, but this strategy is difficult to follow. A high degree of cooperation is required for such action through a nongovernmental agency.

The existing corporation, Los Indigenes, could be the vehicle through which grants and/or loans are acquired. It formerly performed some services commonly regarded as governmental. Despite strife over its control the corporation still has a base of support within the community for a more meaningful role. The belief that the corporation should become more involved in the civic affairs of the community was expressed by 44.1% of the respondents in the survey.[37] However, because only 30 persons from 18 families are members of the corporation, a broadened membership would appear to be necessary if the corporation is to be accepted as a community action vehicle. The most active and widely recognized leader (Gonzales) is not a member of the corporation. It was his letter to the State Planning Office in 1972 which brought a suggestion that federal grants and/or loans for water and waste disposal purposes are available but provided no active assistance in securing it.[38]

Any system built through such a program would require approval of the regional council of governments, in which the City of Las Cruces has a major voice.

Still another strategy which has been tried unsuccessfully is that of gaining recognition as an Indian village, thereby qualifying for federal assistance under the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act.[39] Regardless of the merits of the claims of the Tiwa Indians to recognition and compensation and the desire of the Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce to recreate an "Indian Village", this strategy does not appear to be a viable one for present residents of Tortugas. In fact, the attitudes of residents suggest that the designation "Indian Village" should be laid to rest for Tortugas.

The final choice that residents of Tortugas have is annexation to the City of Las Cruces. Under New Mexico law the area could be annexed against the will of the residents; it could be annexed against the will of the central city; or it could be annexed through the voluntary action of both Tortugas residents and the central city.[40] Voluntary annexation certainly is not feasible at this time, as the residents of Tortugas are overwhelmingly opposed to it. Furthermore, despite favorable opinions expressed in the survey, city officials have been reluctant to assume the financial burden of improvements that would of necessity follow annexation.[41]

Despite the reluctance of concerned parties to accept annexation today, this step may be unavoidable in the long run. Concern for the health of Las Cruces homeowners adjacent to

Tortugas should ultimately force annexation unless residents of the village can eliminate outhouses and septic tanks. Action to that end will require aggressive leadership and much more community cooperation than has been present in recent years. Even so, the costs to Tortugas residents of autonomy may be greater in the long run than would annexation, which would bring taxes but would also bring the much broader financial base of Las Cruces properties. In sum, the prospects for a governmentally autonomous Tortugas with an acceptable level of service do not appear to be good

Conclusion

Herein lies the dilemma for Tortugas and for other communities facing absorption into an urban complex. Although they may have developed some expectations common to suburbanites, residents of such communities do not wish to relinquish either their governmental autonomy or their life-style. In this instance the people of Tortugas can apparently acquire the basic services of urban life only by becoming another barrio in a city dominated by people with a different ethnic background and life-style. They have been drawn into the Las Cruces urban area by forces that do not appear to be reversible. Except for the proprietors of two small business establishments, a pool hall and a grocery store, all employment is outside the community, principally at New Mexico State University, at the White Sands Missile Range and in Las Cruces. Most goods and

services are purchased in the central city.

Finally, the people of Tortugas are powerless to resist whatever fate leaders of the adjacent city may plan for them, be it annexation or recreation of an Indian pueblo that never existed. If their status is analyzed through Blau's schema of power, they have neither the "conditions of independence" (strategic resources, available alternatives, covercive force, ideals lessening needs) nor the "requirements of power" (indifference to what others offer, monopoly over what others need, law and order, materialistic and other relevant values)[42] to determine whether they will become an enclave or a barrio. In this dimension they differ markedly from the white, upper-middle class suburbs the loss of whose resources proponents of metropolitan integration bemoan. A typology of suburbanization that does not take into account the dilemmas faced by such communities as Tortugas is incomplete.

FOOTNOTES

1. Revision of a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, April, 1972.
2. J. J. Bowden, Spanish and Mexican Land Grants in the Chihuahuan Acquisition (Texas Western Press: The University of Texas at El Paso, 1971), p. 71.
3. From a map of Mesilla Valley by K. Carrard, 1st Lieutenant of Dragoons, under the direction of Bvt. Captain J. Pope of the U.S. Corps of Engineers.
4. Wesley R. Hurt, Jr., "Tortugas, An Indian Village in Southern New Mexico", El Palacio, (April, 1952), pp. 106-109.
5. Record of Deeds of Dona Ana County, Book 30, p. 55, February 21, 1907.
6. Record of Deeds of Dona Ana County, Book 29, p. 1082, December 10, 1908.
7. Minutes of Los Indigenes de Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, Book 1, p. 406, Records of Incorporation of Dona Ana County, May 14, 1914.
8. Ibid.
9. Record of Deeds of Dona Ana County, Book 61, p. 421, October 6, 1920.
10. Hurt, "Tortugas," p. 109.
11. C. P. Loomis and O. E. Leonard, "Standards of Living in an Indian-Mexican Village and on a Reclamation Project," Social Research Report No. XIV, U.S. Department of Agriculture (Washington, D.C.: August, 1938), p. 5.

12. Hurt, "Tortugas," p. 112. Miguel Fierro had been an officer of the corporation as early as 1935. Minutes of Meeting May 5, 1935.

13. Los Indigenes de Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe v. Victor A. Roybal et. al. (1948),no. 10810, 3rd Judicial Court, County of Dona Ana, New Mexico.

14. Interview, Margarito Fierro, President of Los Indigenes, Tortugas, N.M., January 23, 1972.

15. Letter of response from Ralph R. Reiser, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, November 18, 1969.

16. Copy of Constitution and minutes of meeting in possession of authors.

17. Use of spelling "Tewa" is apparently in error The more common spelling of the alleged ancestral tribe is "Tiwa" or "Tigua".

18. Letters from Bruce to Representative Manuel Lujan, March 10 and March 11, 1971.

19. Letter from Margarito Fierro to Senator Joseph M. Montoya, July 31, 1971.

20. Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life(New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), especially Chapter 3, "The Nature of Assimilation," p. 71FF.

21. Los Indigenes de Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe v. Roybal (1957) No. 14917, 3rd Judicial Court, County of Dona Ana, N.M.

22. See Leo F. Schnore, "Satellites and Suburbs," Social Forces, 36 (December 1957), pp. 121-127, and his modification in

"The Social and Economic Characterstics of American Suburbs," The Sociological Quarterly, 4 (Spring, 1963), pp. 122-134.

23. Particularly William S. Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1956), pp. 295-456; and David Leisman, "The Suburban Dislocation," The Annals, 314 (Fall, 1957), pp.123-146.

24. See especially Oliver P. Williams, Harold Herman, Charles S. Liebman and Thomas R. Dye, Suburban Differences and Metropolitan Policies: A Philadelphia Story (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylavania Press, 1965), pp. 211-238.

25. Bennett M. Berger, "The Myth of Suburbia," Journal of Social Issues 17, No. 1, (1961), pp. 38-49.

26. Leonard Blumberg and Michael Lalli, "Little Ghettoes: A Study of Negroes in the Suburbs," Phylon, 27 (Summer, 1966), pp. 117-131.

27. "Report of the President's Task Force on Suburban Problems," in Charles M. Haar (ed.),The End of Innocence (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1972), p. 16.

28. S. D. Clark, "The Process of Suburban Development," in John Kramer (ed.), North American Suburbs (Berkeley: Glendessary Press, 1972), pp. 19-30.

29. Ibid., p. 28.

30. The names of the influentials were obtained from another study based on the methodolgy of Perrucci and Pilisuk, which utilizes a combination of an intergovernmental resource base, the reputational technique and an actual

and hypothetical decisional approach. See Robert Perrucci and Marc Pilisuk, "Leaders and Ruling Elites: The Interorganizational Bases of Community Power, "American Sociological Review, 35 (December, 1970), pp. 1040-1057.

31. John R. Seely, R. Alexander Sim and Elizabeth W. Loosley, Crestwood Heights (New York: Basic Books, 1956).

32. Blumbery and Lalli, "Little Ghettoes."

33. Bennett M. Berger, Working Class Suburb (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952).

34. Morris Janowitz, The Community Press In An Urban Setting (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952), Chapter 7.

35. Interview with Henry U. Gaines, Director of Utilities, Las Cruces, New Mexico, November 5, 1971.

36. Chapter 14, Article 2, New Mexico Civil Code.

37. The remaining responses were as follows: 2.8% of the respondents did not care, 37.2% either did not know or did not respond and 15.9% opposed more involvement.

38. Letter from Gilberto T. Apodaca, Assistant Director, Intergovernmental Services, State Planning Office, to Robert B. Gonzales, June 6, 1972. The possibility of annexation was also suggested.

39. 42 U.S.C. 20001-20004a

40. Chapter 14, Article 7, New Mexico Civil Code.

41. Interview with Gaines.

42. Peter M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964), pp. 115-125.

TABLE I - Stages of Indian-Mexican Assimilation

Type or Stage of Assimilation	Indian-Mexican
1. Cultural or Behavior Assimilation	Completely
2. Structural Assimilation	Mostly
3. Marital Assimilation	Completely
4. Identificational Assimilation	Mostly
5. Attitude Receptional Assimilation	Completely
6. Behavioral Receptional Assimilation	Completely
7. Civic Assimilation	Mostly

TABLE II - Problems Mentioned by Residents of Tortugas

Problems	N	% of all problems	% of respondents mentioning problems
I. Lack of Services Usually Found in a City:		(N=249)	(N=109)
Potable drinking water	57	22.9	52.3
Sanitation Services (garbage & sewage)	41	16.4	37.6
Street paving, signs, lighting, numbers	57	22.9	52.3
Other Utilities	5	2.0	4.6
Recreational Facilities	29	11.6	26.6
Fire, police, postal serv.	18	7.2	16.5
II. Improvement of Physical Conditions of School	14	5.6	12.8
III. Greater availability of goods and services	7	2.8	6.4
IV. Improvement of Houses	3	1.2	2.8
V. Problems Internal to the Village (Priest, Corporation, lack of leadership, cooperation, dogs, etc.)	16	6.4	14.7
VI. Employment Opportunities	2	8	1.8
Total	249		

Modal response: 3 or more problems; 1 problem mentioned by 21.4% of respondents; 2 problems mentioned by 21.4% of respondents.

TABLE III - Rank Order of Importance of News Events by Location (In Percentages)

Location	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	No Response
Tortugas	9.3	15.6	14.6	18.6	34.2	33.3
Las Cruces	27.9	26.7	8.3	25.6	18.4	12.1
State	18.6	28.9	25.0	25.6	10.5	6.1
National	14.0	4.4	27.1	20.9	23.7	33.3
International	30.2	24.4	25.0	9.3	13.2	15.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	43	45	48	43	38	33

gamma = -.1368

TABLE IV - Number of Nominations and Percent of Nominators and Nominations of Inside and Outside Leaders.

INSIDE LEADERS				OUTSIDE LEADERS			
Leader	N	% of nominators	% of nominations	Leader	N	% of nominators	% of nominations
Gonzales	36	50.7	23.8	M. Fierro (Pres)	8	11.3	5.3
P. Fierro	12	16.9	7.9	Pena	3	4.2	2.0
Silva	8	11.3	5.3	Dominguez	4	5.6	2.6
Portillo	3	11.3	5.3	Ferralez	2	2.8	1.3
L. Frietze	8	11.3	5.3	Roybal (cacique)	2	2.8	1.3
A. Frietze	5	7.0	3.3	Granados	8	11.3	5.3
Vielma		4.2	2.0			(N=71)	(N-151)
Baldon	3	4.2	2.0	13 leaders with one nomination each			
Paz	3	4.2	2.0				
		(N=71)	(N=151)				

4 leaders with two nominations each
17 leaders with one nomination each